



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/439,435 11/15/99 ROCHE

P 12002

IM62/0811

EXAMINER

BASF CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT
1419 BIDDLE AVENUE
WYANDOTTE MI 48192-3736

SERGEANT, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

5

1711

DATE MAILED:

08/11/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action SummaryApplication No.
09/439,435Applicant(s)
Roche et al.Examiner
Rabon SergeantGroup Art Unit
1711

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☒ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *Certified copies not received: _____.
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1 and 2, drawn to a compact veneer, classified in class 528, subclass 44+.
 - II. Claim 3, drawn to a molding, classified in class 428, subclass 423.1.
 - III. Claim 4, drawn to a process of producing moldings, classified in class 427, subclass 133+.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions of Group I and Group II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as self-supported molded articles and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions of Group I and Group III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the

Art Unit: 1711

process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the compact veneer can be used as a molded product without the use of any foamed polyisocyanate polyaddition product.

Inventions of Group II and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the molding of claim 3 can be made by forming a foamed polyisocyanate polyaddition product and subsequently spray coating the compact veneer thereon.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Fernando Borrego on April 20, 2000 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1 and 2. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 3 and 4 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently

Art Unit: 1711

named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(l).

6. The EPO references cited on the information disclosure statement of November 15, 1999 have not been considered, because they have not been received.

7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

It is unclear how "compact" modifies or further limits "veneer". Applicants have not clearly defined the term.

8. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicants have failed to specify if the molecular weights are weight average or number average or how they have been determined.

9. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1711

Within components b11) and b12), the use of "based on" renders the claims indefinite, because it is unclear to what extent the polyethers are derived from the initiators.

Furthermore, component b13) is not mutually exclusive from components b11), b12), or b14), and component b14) is not mutually exclusive from components b11), b12), or b13).

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schwindt et al. ('423) or Grogler et al. ('497).

Patentees disclose polyurethane casting compositions suitable for producing molded elastomeric coverings, comprising the reaction product of a polyisocyanate and a propylene oxide derived polyether polyol, wherein the polyol is present in an amount which meets applicants' claims. See abstract; column 4, lines 3-21, 67, and 68; column 5, lines 1-12; and column 7, lines 51-63, within Schwindt et al. See abstract; column 11, lines 3-22; and example 3, within Grogler et al. It is noted that applicants' mixture (b1) is open to the inclusion of additional components.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

Sergent/ns

August 2, 2000


RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER